

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/682,005

Applicant(s)

MAZEREEUW, GEORGE

Examiner

Kim Huynh

Art Unit

2182

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kim Huynh.

(3) Bill Zychlewicz (Reg. no. 51,366).

(2) Thomas Fisher (Reg. no. 47,564).

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 5/21/03.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: ____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Allos (US 4,707,760).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Fisher and Zychlewicz (the attorneys) argued that the term RMS in the claim limitation overcome the Allos reference, the examiner indicated that the original disclosure failed to provide support for the RMS terminology. The attorneys argued that it was conventional in the art to use the term "voltage" to refer to the RMS voltage. The examiner also indicate that the amendment filed 5/6/03 further introduced new matter in the disclosure since there was no support for the detection of low and high RMS voltage condition. The attorneys argued that Fig. 2 supported the detection as claimed. The examiner requested a modification of the specification to particularly point out how such circuit performs the detection of RMS voltages for consideration of the new matter. The attorneys indicated a supplemental amendment would be submitted to provide such support .